

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 13 and 18 are amended for clarity (and are unrelated to issues of patentability).

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments merely clarify that the plurality of groups of channel numbers are displayed. This is not a new issue since the claims relate to displaying an Internet site search view that includes the channel number range destination window. Entry is therefore proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by U.S. Patent 6,411,307 to Rosin (hereafter Rosin 1) and U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0012024 to Rosin et al. (hereafter Rosin 2) and U.S. Patent 6,518,984 to Maeckel et al. (hereafter Maeckel). The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites displaying the Internet site search menu on the screen of the video apparatus. Independent claim 1 also recites that the channel number range destination window includes a plurality of displayed groups of channel numbers, each displayed group having a prescribed range of channel numbers, which is different for each displayed group, and the channel numbers arranged within the channel guide window correspond to the prescribed range of one of the displayed groups that is selected by the user.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action states that Rosin 1 does not teach or suggest the claimed Internet site search menu that includes the claimed channel number range destination window. The Office Action (on page 3, lines 10-11) appears to state that Rosin 2 discloses the claimed channel number range destination window. However, applicants believe this is a typographical error as Rosin 2 does not teach or suggest the claimed channel number range destination window. The Office Action then asserts that Maeckel teaches the claimed channel number range destination window. The Office Action cites Maeckels FIGs. 3 and 9B and col. 7, lines 32-47. However, Maeckel does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1.

More specifically, Maeckel relates to a graphical interface regarding displaying records of a database. For example, Maeckel discloses that a slider control 308 may be used to control a batch of records that may be displayed in a database viewing page. See col. 7, lines 20-30. That is, FIG. 3 shows a background grid 306 that represents an entire database of records. See col. 7, lines 19-20. A user may then move a slider control 308 up or down over the grid 306 to control the records that may be displayed within a database viewing page on a screen. See, for example, the database view page 914 shown in FIG. 9B. FIG. 3 also shows a record range 314 and a record range text box 316. These items may be used to show a size of a batch of records that are displayed in the database viewing page. In other words, as described in col. 8, lines 1-8, if the current record range is 1-5, then records 1-5 may be displayed within the viewing area.

Reply to Office Action dated June 15, 2006

Maeckel clearly does not relate to a plurality of displayed groups of channel numbers where each displayed group has a prescribed range of channel numbers, which is different for each displayed group. That is, Maeckel only relates to a single displayed range (i.e., FIG. 3 only shows a range of 1-5). Maeckel does not teach or suggest the ability to display a plurality of groups of channel numbers (i.e., the claimed plurality of displayed groups of channel numbers). Furthermore, Maeckel discloses setting the record range at col. 10, lines 10-46 with respect to FIG. 7. This section also has no suggestion for a plurality of displayed groups of channel numbers.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Maeckel does not teach or suggest the claimed channel range destination window that includes the plurality of displayed groups of channel numbers, each displayed group having a prescribed range of channel numbers, which is different for each displayed group, and the channel numbers arranged within the channel guide window correspond to the prescribed range of one of the displayed groups that is selected by the user. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

Independent claim 13 recites that the displayed Internet site search menu further includes a channel number destination window for arranging the channel numbers in the channel guide window and having a plurality of displayed groups of channel numbers, each displayed group having a prescribed range of channel numbers, which is different for each displayed group, and the channel numbers arranged within the channel guide window correspond to the prescribed

range of one of the displayed groups that is selected by the user. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 13. Thus, independent claim 13 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1 and 13 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 6 recites that the one of displayed groups that is selected by the user among the plurality of displayed groups is displayed to be different from the displayed groups that are not selected by the user in color and brightness and to have a three-dimensional outline. See also dependent claim 18. In discussing claim 6, the Office Action asserts that Rosin's FIGs. 5, 6 and 8 correspond to the claimed features. However, Rosin does not relate to displayed groups of channel numbers and/or to one displayed group that is selected by a user. Therefore, Rosin does not teach or suggest the features of dependent claim 6. The other applied references also do not teach or suggest these features of dependent claim 6 and 18 missing from Rosin. Accordingly, dependent claims 6 and 18 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-30 are earnestly

Serial No. **09/989,397**

Docket No. **P-0295**

Reply to Office Action dated June 15, 2006

solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

**Date: September 13, 2006**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**